

II. REMARKS

Claim Objections

The examiner objected to claims 1, 3-14, 20, 21, and 34 because of informalities. Applicant has amended the claims to address each of the informalities.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The examiner rejected claims 1, 3-14, 16-21, and 23-40 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14, 20, 21, and 34 to remove the basis of the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6-14, 16-19, 21, 23, 24, 26-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curtis (US 6,442,754, hereinafter “Curtis”) in view of Foster (US 6,675,382, “Foster”). The examiner rejected claims 20, 34, 35, and 37-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curtis.

Independent Claims 1, 20, 21, and 34


Claim 1 distinguishes over the cited art for at least the following reason. Claim 1 recites “an indication of incompatibility with a previously installed component.” The examiner cites Curtis FIG. 5, col. 13:7-27 and 33-37 as disclosing the element that contains the above referenced limitation. But *Curtis* fails to teach a data structure providing “an indication of incompatibility with a previously installed component,” at least because the cited portions of

Curtis are silent any form of “indication of incompatibility,” much less of “an indication of incompatibility with a previously installed component.”

Conclusion

Since independent claims 1, 20, 21, and 34 distinguish over the prior art for at least the reason set forth above, the remaining dependent claims depend from allowable claims. Therefore, all claims are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Rudolf O. Siegesmund

Registration No. 37,720

Gordon & Rees LLP

Suite 2800

2100 Ross Avenue

Dallas, Texas 75201

214-231-4703

214-461-4053 (fax)

rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com